



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## A REMINISCENCE<sup>1</sup>

By G. STANLEY HALL

Brethren: Our president's invitation to me to speak at this anniversary banquet calls for reminiscence. Dr. Wiley of pure-food fame, who ought to know, says that the older a man is, the better he is or should be unless senile involution has reached his psyche. Having for some months not very successfully or pleasantly wrestled with the problem of trying to realize what three-score and ten means, besides the ideal view that it is the youth of old age I feel that I can already report some progress toward realizing not only that early senescence is not so bad as it is painted, but that its study is likely to prove even more interesting than that of adolescence ever was. I am, at any rate, rather glad to overcome my horror of anecdotage and of being personal, in the effort to make the younger members of this association realize, in some respects at least the difference between the rather painful past of psychology in this country and its splendid present. My memories in the department our now broadened association represents go back to college days under Mark Hopkins, who taught us a mixed system of theology and metaphysics so simple and final that very few indeed of his many generations of pupils ever went any farther than he left them. In his later years he confided to me that he had once tried to read Bohn's translation of "Mr." Kant, but never got beyond the first paragraph, which he could not understand. His scheme of the world provided ready-made answers to all great questions, and pretty effectually inoculated his pupils against any more serious infections by the muse of philosophy, who was always represented as dangerous because trust in reason was so liable to mislead the soul.

We had a touch, but not too much, of Sir William Hamilton, Jouffroy, a few dangerous *aperçus* into Hickok, and because I composed a crude essay on John Stuart Mill and developed an ephebic calenture for Carlyle and Emerson, the latter of whom was given a very cold reception when he gave a course of lectures in town, I was regarded upon graduation as distinctly out of the fold.

The next year, in New York, I most happily fell under the influence of George S. Morris, the translator of Überweg, read his proof sheets, and found that the history of philosophy, which I had been taught was a pitfall of skepticism leading men to hold any, every, or no opinion, made such an appeal to me that I went to Europe for three years. I studied with Trendelenburg of Berlin, the great Aristotelian of his day, with Zeller and Kuno Fischer at Heidelberg, and with Benno Erdmann, an eclectic, at Bonn. I followed Dorner, who represented Schleiermacher, and Karl Rosenkranz, the last of the Hegelians, getting a touch of Herbart, who was then represented by no less than three professors at Leipzig, and seeing incidentally the War of 1870

<sup>1</sup> Read at the 25th meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, December, 1916.

from the German side. On returning home, feeling myself very advanced, I offered my services to various colleges and universities but in vain, till a state institution in the middle west gave me, as I thought definitely, an appointment. Three months later, however, I had a letter from the president stating that it had been decided, after maturer deliberation, that a man who had studied the history of philosophy in Germany would probably be more or less infected with pantheistic tendencies, and that to teach the systems of different men, rather than one definite system, would unsettle young men, and that therefore the engagement must be canceled.

Then came a year of anxious and watchful waiting, and finally, as a professor of modern languages in a small but liberal Ohio institution, I was kindly permitted by the Unitarian president to teach philosophy on the side as an extra, in his place. Then came a period of study and teaching at Harvard, under Bowen, Everett, Hedge, Elliot Cabot, Palmer, and James, the latter of whom had a tiny laboratory under a stairway in the Agassiz Museum, containing a metronome, several optical charts, diagrams of the brain, ear and eye, with a dish for rotating a frog. Meanwhile I was doing more or less serious work on muscles in the physiological laboratory of the Harvard Medical School under Henry P. Bowditch, pioneer of the new physiology in this country. Meanwhile, too, the first one-volume edition of Wundt's psychology had appeared, which together with Fechner's work, Helmholtz's on the eye and ear, and a few other things, I studied under the guidance of and for several years in the closest intimacy with the charming and inspiring personality of James.

Then followed a second triennium in Europe, with a little work in Wundt's laboratory, just opened at Leipzig, but doing also a slight piece of work with Helmholtz, and much more in Ludwig's laboratory, where I was associated with Von Frey, Gaule, Flechsig, Von Kries, and others. Wundt and his new work were then looked on not only with suspicion but with active criticism by his colleagues. He had been dismissed as an assistant by Helmholtz because of his lack of mathematical training and of severe scientific method, as Helmholtz thought, while physiologists and medical men generally regarded him as an interloper in their field. Reaction to and compensation for this long period of harsh criticism, aggravated by the fact that Wundt had been elected to his position in Leipzig after the severest competition with Horwicz, doubtless had much to do with the, as I think, hyper-development or affectation of a methodology in our domain modeled too much on the ideals of physics, a field where biological affinities are closer and much more suggestive.

Before returning to this country, although I had an academic appointment awaiting me here, fearing a repetition of the former disappointment, I spent two or three months in hasty visitations to many educational institutions, feeling that in this domain, at least, I might make certain applications of philosophy which would supply me a livelihood. This was fortunate, because I had hardly landed when another letter from another college president informed me that as he had learned I had been studying psychology in a laboratory, I could not help being too materialistic to be safe. Hence the very slight and superficial knowledge I had acquired of education came in good stead during a critical and anxious year.

Johns Hopkins, then perhaps almost at the acme of its leadership, decided with great hesitation, as I was afterwards told, to give ex-

perimental psychology a try-out, very tentatively however, with an appointment first for six months, then for one year, then three, then five years, with an appropriation of one thousand dollars a year for apparatus. Dr. McCosh from Princeton severely arraigned the institution for taking this step, and attacked scathingly various things that I had said. My predecessors there, older and far more competent than I, Charles Pierce, George Morris, and even James, who had given several courses of lectures there, had attracted a few students of great promise.—Jastrow, Cattell, Dewey, Patrick, Noyes, Taber, Sanford, Burnham, Motora, and others; and I was even enabled to have Donaldson as an assistant in the domain of neurology, of which I knew little.

Here, too, I had to occupy the unique position of Superintendent of the Bay View Insane Asylum, as *locum tenens* before the opening of the medical school. This I had to visit and inspect twice weekly, taking the responsibility of receiving and discharging patients, holding clinics, etc. In this environment, with the stimulus of trying to make good to colleagues, president and trustees a new department which I knew was an experiment, and against which the same prejudices existed as were felt toward Wundt at Leipzig; stimulated, too, by a perhaps almost unprecedented group of able students; in the exhilarating atmosphere of a university itself new and in some sense itself a great experiment; one found the very highest possible incentive for the hardest kind of work.

One Sunday afternoon I received a call from a wealthy stranger from Philadelphia, J. Pearsall Smith, who had heard of a new department of psychology, and who suggested that I start a journal, handing me on the spot a check for five hundred dollars to that end, with the intimation that more would follow. It proved that his interest centered in psychic research, which the Journal criticized, so that his contribution was never repeated. This was the origin of the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY, which I began with such great expectations and printing so many thousand copies that the first number, when it was printed, circularized and distributed, cost over fifteen hundred dollars. Soon I found two bitter disappointments. The beginning of the second year showed only a little over one hundred subscribers, and an unexpected dearth of material, so that anyone who turns to the early volumes will find a very large part of them made up of innumerable book reviews, other material written by myself, a large part of the large-type material from my own laboratory, and still other articles in allied fields or of rather inferior quality. There was nothing to do, however, but to persevere, although at the end of a few years I had sunk over eight thousand dollars of my own hard earnings in the JOURNAL, which only five years ago began to show a clear balance, the first year of thirty-one dollars to the good. In those days there was no usable text-book in psychology in English, so that when Ladd's book appeared in 1886 it was a godsend.

This Association was started twenty-five years ago in response to an invitation from Clark University, that had then just been organized. The first members of the Association at this meeting were Angell, Baldwin, Bryan, Burnham, Cattell, Cowles, Delabarre, Dewey, Fullerton, Griffin, Hall, Hume, Hyslop, James, Jastrow, Krohn, Ladd, Nichols, Noyes, Patrick, Royce, Sanford, Scripture, Witmer and Wolfe. The new members elected at this meeting were Wesley Mills, Münsterberg, Ormond, Pace and Titchener.

At the second meeting, at Philadelphia, it was my pleasant function

as presiding officer to introduce to the Association for the first time Professor Münsterberg, who had established himself during the year at Harvard. The early history of the Association has been admirably written by Professor Buchner, and here my bald narrative may well stop.

Cattell, who had done such brilliant work in Germany and England, soon started a laboratory at Pennsylvania under very favorable auspices; Jastrow at Wisconsin; Baldwin was already doing signal work at Toronto; Dewey at Michigan; Titchener at Cornell; of course Ladd at Yale; and now there are hundreds of laboratories, academic and non-academic, where studies more or less psychological are made. American psychologists are falling into natural groups according to their tastes and abilities, representing introspection, behaviorism, study of animals, geneticism, border-line, pathological and anthropological work (in which I think we ought to include the new realism, with its pragmatic trend); and there are waves of new interest represented by tests, standards, and the great corporation movement, which realizes that the greatest natural resource of a country is men fitted by native attributes to their callings. Thus the prospect of psychology to-day in this country is unprecedentedly bright, and we seem well able to accept the enormous new responsibility for leadership that is now laid upon us by the shortage of scientific output owing to the war in Europe. Henceforth this country must take a new leadership in this field, and those interested in various special lines should realize that psychology has become vastly too large to be represented by any individual, group or school, and that specialization, already so well developed that none of us is able to understand all the papers read in our meetings, will go on, for in a sense that none of us ever dreamed this seems destined to become a psychological age, and there is a sense, too, in which democracy can never become complete without intensive individual psychology. While we deplore the loss of the great Harvard trio, James, Royce, and Münsterberg, younger men are developing who will without doubt make good their places, and more. A new science like ours ought in a general way to attract ever better men, so that the younger you are the better you ought to be. Measured in this way, American psychology to-day has everything to hope and nothing to fear.